

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,384	12/13/2005	Tomiya Sonoda	M1071.1943	3841
32172 DICKSTEIN S	7590 12/28/200 HAPIRO LLP	EXAMINER		
1177 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS (6TH AVENUE)			JONES, STEPHEN E	
NEW YORK, NY 10036-2714			· ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		•	2817	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/28/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
• t	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summers	10/560,384	SONODA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Stephen E. Jones	2817				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	_• .					
<i>'</i> = <i>'</i> -	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
,	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims	•					
4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-10 are subject to restriction and/or expressions.		•				
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 11) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 12) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 13) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 14) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 15) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 16) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 17) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 18) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 19) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 19) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 11) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 11) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 12) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 13) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 14) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 15) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 16) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 17) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 18) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 19) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 19) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 19) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 19) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 19) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 19) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 19) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 19) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 19) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 19) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 19) The specification is objected to by	epted or b) \square objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is object.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicativity documents have been received in Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)		. •				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate				

10/560,384 Art Unit: 2817

Election/Restrictions

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

<u>Species</u>	<u>Figures</u>
1.	1-3;
II.	4-7;
III.	9;
IV.	10;
V.	11 ;
VI.	12;
VII.	13;
VIII.	14;
IX.	15;
X .	16;
XI.	18;
XII.	19.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims

Application/Control Number:

10/560,384 Art Unit: 2817

subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

None of the claims are generic

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Species I. has the special technical feature of through holes. Species II through XII. have strip electrodes as a special technical feature instead of through holes. Furthermore, Species II through XII each has a special technical feature of a unique (from the other figures) strip electrode shape as seen in the figures.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of

10/560,384 Art Unit: 2817

record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen E. Jones whose telephone number is 571-272-1762. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert J. Pascal can be reached on 571-272-1769. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SEJ

STEPHEN E. JONES PRIMARY EXAMINER